

THE SUNDAY JOURNAL

SUNDAY, MARCH 1, 1903.  
Telephone Calls (Old and New),  
Business Office, 2238 | Editorial Rooms, 260  
TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.  
BY CARRIER—INDIANAPOLIS AND SUBURBS.  
Daily, Sunday included, 20 cents per month.  
Daily, without Sunday, 15 cents per month.  
Sunday only, without daily, 5 cents per month.  
Single copies, 5 cents.  
BY AGENTS EVERYWHERE.  
Daily, per week, 10 cents.  
Daily, Sunday included, per week, 15 cents.  
Sunday only, per week, 5 cents.  
BY MAIL PREPAID.  
Daily edition, one year, \$2.00.  
Daily and Sunday Home Year, \$2.50.  
Sunday only, one year, \$1.50.  
REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.  
Weekly Edition.  
One copy, one year, \$1.00.  
One copy, six months, \$0.50.  
One copy, three months, \$0.25.  
One copy, one month, \$0.10.  
Single copies, 5 cents.  
REDUCED RATES TO AGENTS.  
Subscribers with any of our numerous agents or send subscription to  
JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY  
Indianapolis, Ind.  
Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page paper, twelve-page paper, or a sixteen-page paper, as the case may be, and enclose postage in full. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.  
All communications intended for publication in this paper must be in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the contributor, and be sent to the editorial office.  
Rejected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is enclosed for that purpose.  
Entered as second-class matter at Indianapolis, Ind., postoffice.  
THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL  
Can be found at the following places:  
NEW YORK—Astor House.  
CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street; Auditorium Annex Hotel, Dearborn Street News Stand, 111 Dearborn Street.  
CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., Arcade.  
LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northeast corner of Third and Jefferson streets; Louisville Book Co., 24 Fourth Avenue, and Bluefield Bank, 42 West Market Street.  
ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.  
WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House, Fairfax Hotel, Willard Hotel.  
DENVER, Col.—Latham & Jackson, Fifteenth and Lawrence streets.  
DAYTON, O.—J. V. Wilkie, 33 South Jefferson Street.  
COLUMBUS, O.—Viscount News Stand, 284 High Street.  
The Spartansburg (S. C.) school teacher who shot and killed an obstreperous pupil the other day should retain Senator Tillman for his defense. The Tillman family knows how it is.  
Congress will incur grave responsibility and deserve public censure if it fails to do something for the relief of the Filipinos after Governor Taft's dispatch and the President's urgent message.  
During several unpleasant weeks this city enjoyed a disagreeable notoriety as being perhaps the only one where grave-robbing had been systematically and extensively practiced. Now it appears there are others.  
There should be some method to bring a debate to an end in the United States Senate besides keeping the Senate in session until a single senator opposing a measure talks himself to a state of collapse, as it is proposed to do with Senator Morgan.  
When legislative bodies in all the States reach the point that the man who is sent to state prison for the third time shall stay there the rest of his life the careers of the worst criminals, like Knapp, will be cut short and human lives will be saved.  
After a long fight in the Pennsylvania Legislature and much oratory for and against the measure a bill has been passed making the minimum rate of salary of school teachers in the State \$3. That is \$3.5 a week for six or eight months in the year. And yet Pennsylvanians will wonder why they cannot secure the best educational talent.  
There can be little doubt that Mayor Bookwalter acts wisely in vetoing the plumbers' inspection ordinance. Some ordinance relative to plumbing may be necessary, but an inspector to issue licenses to plumbers, to allow permits for plumbing and to inspect all plumbing work in the city involves a very extensive and comprehensive system.  
Attorney General Knox says the Department of Justice "is not a party in any way" to the bill now pending in Congress to establish a government laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper and defective classes. The bill savors of empiricism, and the reputation of the alleged professionalist who is pushing it does not strengthen its claim for respectful consideration.  
There has been too much of that tinkering variety of bills presented to the Legislature, such as that vetoed by the Governor yesterday, namely, the bill to authorize the circuit judge in this county to authorize the Probate Court to increase the salaries of clerks. It is too small business for a Legislature to be passing laws authorizing somebody to increase somebody's salary. But the primary election bill seems compelled to wait upon such legislation.  
It is now made known that the sideboard sold to a saloon keeper in Washington was not the one which some temperance women gave to Mrs. Rutherford B. Hayes, because she would not permit wine to be served in the White House, but one which was purchased while Mr. Arthur was President. So the W. C. T. U. has made its protest in vain, and the saloon keeper will not get three times as much as he paid for it from those who were anxious to deliver it out of his hands.  
Mrs. Ballington Booth's recommendation to railroad managers that victims of railroad accidents who are fatally injured shall have their sufferings ended by the administration of anesthetics is not practicable. No railroad and no physicians would take such responsibility. Unless members of the sufferer's family were present to authorize and approve such a proceeding there would always remain the possibility that after the victim's death his relatives would claim that it was not necessary and would not have occurred in the absence of the anesthetics. Moreover, it might happen that the doctors would really make mistakes. The subject is too dangerous a one to deal with.  
The Supreme Court of the United States recently handed down a decision upholding the constitutionality of a Massachusetts law limiting the height of buildings on a certain square in Boston. The object of the law is to protect the artistic appearance of the square from being marred by "sky scrapers." The decision suggests a question whether such a law should not be passed relative to the height of buildings on Monument Place. A sky scraper in this locality would seriously and permanently detract from the artistic effect of the soldiers' monument. True, there is no talk of erecting such a building now, but it is only a question of time when there will be. The buildings on Monument Place should be as nearly of uniform height as practicable, and none should be higher than the Columbia Club building. It would be a fine thing if they could all be of the same general type of architecture.

AS TO A PURE WATER SUPPLY.

Recent occurrences have caused some anxiety as to the continued purity of the city's water supply. As far as the Journal knows, all official analyses heretofore have demonstrated its purity, and there has been reason to believe that the water supply of this city was as pure as that of any other city in the country. Reference is had to the public supply, as there is probably not a well in the city except those of great depth that is not contaminated. Some recent unofficial analyses have raised sufficient doubt as to the purity of the city water to justify further investigation, which, it is hoped, will demonstrate the purity of the water, as previous ones have. But there is the future to be considered. If the city water is pure now, how is its purity to be maintained? If the present source of supply is all right, will that of the future be? The growth of the city and of neighboring cities and towns and rural populations will add constantly to the causes of water pollution, not only in streams, but in running wells. Can this inevitable pollution be cured by filtration? A recent statement that the water company thought of drawing its supply from Fall creek below the new army post has raised a question whether that would be a satisfactory source of supply, and, if it is now, will it be fifty years hence when the population of the towns and the country adjacent to the creek will be several times as great as at present? These are important questions, because every generation has responsibilities for succeeding ones, and must plan for the future as well as for the present.

Probably no event of recent years has furnished more conclusive and indisputable evidence of the operation of polluted water in causing typhoid fever than the recent experience at Ithaca, N. Y. The proof furnished there has been so overwhelming and the results so tragic that there will never be any doubt on the subject hereafter either among professionals or laymen. In future medical works the Ithaca case will become what lawyers call a leading case, and it will practically close discussion as to the direct action of polluted water in causing typhoid fever. The same pollution that occurred at Ithaca may occur in any water that is not drawn from a source beyond the possibility of pollution, or that is not purified by a process that admits of no doubt. A century ago every stream and creek in Indiana carried pure water; now not one does. The natural increase of population would account for this in part, but other causes have assisted. In recent years manufactures have turned their poisonous refuse into streams in utter disregard of health and of law. The law against the pollution of streams is almost a dead letter, though there are indications of more vigorous efforts to enforce it. The chief hydrographer of the United States geological survey has recently been examining White river at Anderson and at other points, and he found it seriously polluted. He says that deep wells cannot be depended upon, or, if they furnish pure water for a while, it will eventually become impure. He is of opinion that filtration will be necessary to purify water drawn from White river, either directly or indirectly. He found the refuse from strawboard works a prolific source of pollution. It is understood that the United States geological survey will continue the work of examining the streams of Indiana, and as the reports of its agents will be fearless and impartial there is reason to hope their investigations will result in good.

Great claims have been made for filtration, and if thoroughly carried out it is unquestionably of great benefit. But the idea that polluted water purifies itself by running a few miles or by seeping through the soil a few rods is obsolete. Even mechanical filtration has its limitations. If thoroughly performed it will remove all germs of disease and all insoluble particles of foreign matter, but there are certain soluble poisons, not deadly but still injurious, which it does not remove. These will cause typhoid fever or any such disease, but they may cause or aggravate stomach or kidney troubles. Filtration cannot make "hard" water soft nor remove certain salts that are more or less injurious. Boiling is an excellent means of purifying contaminated water, and distillation is still better, but these methods cannot be used on a large scale or for an entire city.

Apparently about all the city authorities can do is to see that the water company draws its supply from the purest source available, that this source is carefully guarded against pollution from any quarter and that the most approved means of mechanical filtration are used. The idea that running water purifies itself must be abandoned, and after all other means of rendering it pure have been used it should be examined microscopically and chemically as often as two or three times a week, so as to detect the first appearance of pollution or deterioration. The Journal understands that the water company is now preparing to put in an extensive filtering system. Undoubtedly that is necessary, no matter from what source it draws its supply, and the health authorities should see that it is the best system in use.

THE DECISION IN THE LOTTERY CASES.

The recent decision in the United States Supreme Court in the lottery cases has caused considerable comment as to its scope and possible effect. Most of the comment approves of the decision as sound in principle and declaratory of a necessary power of Congress, but some persons think it asserts a dangerous power. The New York Tribune regards it as "another milestone which marks the progress of law in the development of nationality," and as "one more proof of the capacity of the United States government to protect the general interest in the face of new and unforeseen emergencies." The New York Evening Post thinks the decision "marks a new affirmation and exaltation of the power of Congress over commerce of all kinds between the States," that "it clears the way for future action and puts an end to the talk of an amendment of the Constitution in order to give Congress adequate power." The New York Sun, on the other hand, thinks the decision affirms a very dangerous principle. "According to this decision," says the Sun, "it is Congress in the exercise of plenary power which decides whether interstate traffic in a given article

is moral or immoral, expedient or inexpedient, legitimate or illegal. Having enacted the morality or expediency or illegality of this or that article of interstate commerce Congress may proceed to prohibit absolutely any traffic between the States in that article." In illustration of this view the Sun enumerates several superstitious laws of an extreme nature which Congress might pass under this construction of the Constitution. Following are some of them:

A law prohibiting any person from crossing the line between one State and another; providing a future Congress of philosophers should in its wisdom enact a law to keep citizens at home for the purpose, let us suppose, of preventing citizens of Connecticut or New Jersey from coming to New York to practice the professions or to do business here in competition with the citizens of New York. A law closing to traffic every ferry line across the lower Hudson and across the Delaware at Philadelphia, if Congress should decide that ferries to great cities promote immorality.

It is hardly worth while to attribute preposterous motives to Congress or to suspect it of absolute idiosyncrasy.

The law of 1896 provides that any person who shall cause to be brought within the United States from abroad for the purpose of disposing of the same or carried from one State to another in the United States any paper, certificate or instrument purporting to be or representing a ticket, chance, share or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery shall be punishable, etc. Congress did not declare its motive for passing this law and did not have to. It simply enacted that lottery tickets should not be brought into the United States from abroad nor be carried or shipped from one State to another. It treated lottery tickets as an article of traffic, and therefore coming under the general head of commerce. The provision of the Constitution which gives Congress power to regulate commerce among the several States covers every imaginable kind of commerce, including the traffic in lottery tickets among the rest. The Supreme Court did not inquire as to the motive of Congress in passing the law nor as to the necessity for it or the wisdom of it. The sole question before the court was whether under the Constitution Congress had the same power to regulate interstate commerce in lottery tickets that it had to regulate any and all other kinds of interstate commerce. The court held that it had, and that the unequal power to regulate included the power to prohibit. Justice Harlan stated the point very clearly in summing up. He said:

We decide nothing more in the present case than that lottery tickets are subjects of traffic among those who choose to sell or buy them; that the carriage of such tickets by independent carriers from one State to another, and the carriage of such tickets under the exercise of such commerce among the several States Congress has the power to regulate. It is not a question of the wisdom of such legislation, but of the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the States. The power is not to be questioned by the fact that the exercise of the power is not in the hands of the States, but in the hands of Congress.

This does not give Congress any new power nor power to interfere with any person's personal liberty or inalienable rights. It simply declares that the clause in the Constitution which gives Congress power to regulate commerce among the States means exactly what it says. It follows, of course, that it means that Congress may, if it sees fit, regulate or prohibit interstate commerce in any article whatever in the products of any trust. This is a large power, but the Constitution gives Congress other large powers. Thus far they have never been exercised except for the public welfare, and there is no reason to believe or fear that they ever will be.

A DIPLOMATIST'S FALL.

Many diplomats have been mixed up with bottles of wine, and some may have lost their jobs by it, but the case of Dr. Von Holleben, late German ambassador to the United States, is peculiar.

When the German Emperor's yacht Meteor was christened last spring it was given out that the bottle of wine broken on the prow of the ship by Miss Roosevelt was French champagne. This started a controversy which led to a libel suit and ended in the German ambassador's recall, probably in disgrace. The suit for libel was instituted by Kessler & Co., of New York, American agents for the French wine, against Jacob Best, of Milwaukee, agent for the German wine. The facts brought out on the trial showed that Dr. Von Holleben had been acting as a sort of "publicity agent" for the German wine, getting some table perquisites out of it, and after an arrangement had been made to use French wine at the christening he endeavored to have the German wine substituted. The Milwaukee agents employed a well-known German editor to go to Washington and see about it. The editor saw the ambassador, who said: "In my opinion a German or an American wine ought to be used, but you go and see Quadt." This was Count Quadt, secretary of the German legation. He told the editor it was all right, and "I'll have your wine there." The Milwaukee agents were so well satisfied with this assurance that they sent Dr. Von Holleben fourteen cases of German wine, one bottle of which was in a leather case and decorated for the christening. In the meantime a conference was held to arrange the details of the christening, and then Von Holleben was informed that the French wine had already been selected and that no change could be made. On the day of the launching the Milwaukee agent had a representative present who wanted to see that his wine was really used, but he was put off with an evasive reply by Dr. Von Holleben. The agent was not satisfied and afterwards wrote to Von Holleben, who replied by telegraph, saying that the German wine was used. That was his undoing, for the French wine had been used and he knew it. But he had received the fourteen cases of German wine and had assured the agent that the bottle of German wine should be used, and as it was not, he had to get out of the situation the best way he could. It proved to be the worst way. Having put down the wine he had to put up "a bluff," and he did it by wiring a falsehood. His telegram that the German wine was used was made the basis of an advertisement in the Milwaukee editor's paper, in which the New York agent of the French wine was accused of advertising that his wine had been used when he knew it to be false. The New York agent immediately brought suit for libel and proved on the trial that the bottle of German wine furnished by Von Holleben was left unbroken. The Milwaukee agent's defense was Von Holleben's telegram, which had stated an untruth. The case was tried in Milwaukee and the jury gave a verdict of \$2,000 for the plaintiffs—the largest amount ever given in Wisconsin

in a suit for libel. Before the suit was brought Dr. Von Holleben asked for a leave of absence on the ground that he was ill, and the New York agents filed charges against him with the State Department at Washington. An investigation brought out the main facts and the libel suit did the rest. Of course, Dr. Von Holleben was recalled.

It is doubtful if history furnishes an example of a distinguished diplomat being brought to grief through a chain of such seemingly trifling circumstances. If Von Holleben had admitted to the Milwaukee agent that he had been unable to have the German wine used for the christening, and had offered to pay for the fourteen cases he had received, there would have been no trouble. The lesson is that even trained diplomats may lie once too often.

MIRACLES.

There has been some discussion in the columns of the Journal as to the possibility or credibility of miracles, but it has not brought those who believe in them and those who do not any nearer together. The truth is it is altogether a matter of faith. The argument that a miracle is impossible because it implies a suspension of the laws of nature has no force for him who believes in God and in the divinity of Christ. For him the so-called laws of nature are simply the laws of God, and the power of the will that established them can suspend them or change their operation in any particular case. It is hardly necessary for one who denies the existence of God to deny the possibility of miracles. From his point of view there can, of course, be no such thing as a miracle. On the other hand, he who believes in the existence of God and that Christ was of divine origin finds no difficulty in believing in miracles, because the greater includes the less. From a logical point of view to say that a miracle cannot exist because it is contrary to the laws of nature is begging the question, because it assumes that the laws of nature are just as we think them to be, and never different. It assumes that the power which established them cannot suspend them without our knowledge and consent. A writer on the subject says:

We know absolutely nothing of the mode of operation in any recorded miracle; we only see certain results. To affirm that such results are either impossible or that they are necessarily violations of natural law is to pronounce a judgment on impossible data. We can only say that, under an impulse which we must believe proceeds from the divine will, in which all laws exist, the phenomena which we have been accustomed to expect have not followed on their ordinary conditions. But from our point of view we cannot affirm that the question as to how this happens is one of interference or violation; it is rather probably one of higher and lower action. The miracle may be but the expression of one divine order and beneficent will in a new shape, the law of a greater freedom swallowing up the law of a lesser.

Any discussion as to the credibility of the miracles recorded in the New Testament is defective that does not take account of the circumstances under which they were performed—recorded by contemporaneous writers—and of the strong corroborative testimony by which they are supported. The personal testimony by which some of them are supported would be sufficient, if given verbally, to establish them to the satisfaction of any impartial jury. None of them was performed in private, nor in the dark, nor behind a door. They were performed for the most part in the open light of day, and in the presence of avowed enemies of Christ. If the disciples were credulous or deceived why did not the enemies of the miracle worker expose him? Christ did not claim that they were miracles. He simply did them, and let it go at that. They who saw them called them miracles because they could not explain them. From their point of view they were miracles, but from Christ's point of view they were merely unusual exercises of supernatural power for a certain purpose. It is a significant fact that not one of the disciples nor of the early Christians or fathers of the church called miracles. They accepted them without question as part of the true record of the life of Christ. The argument that they could not have occurred because they violated the laws of nature is of comparatively modern origin.

HOME-MADE HEATHEN.

An agent of the American Bible Society traveling in Connecticut reports that he finds polygamy frequent in the back towns of that State, by which he means that the marriage relation is disregarded and that many people in those parts are without any religion or attempt at right living. The Hartford Courant does not attempt to deny or even palliate this announcement, but admits that it is true not only in the back towns of Connecticut, but of rural Massachusetts and other New England States. Doubtless many people who talk of Puritanical Sundays when indignant over the failure to obtain legal consent to play baseball on Sunday, and who talk of Connecticut "blue laws" as if they ever existed, will be surprised by this report and the Hartford paper's calm acceptance of its correctness. These are the towns where the town official, 150 years ago, searched the Sabbath audience with eager eye to see if every man were present, and woe to him who failed to avail himself of the means of grace several Sundays in succession without valid excuse. In those towns all were taxed for the support of the preacher, and those who were not members of the church could not vote in town meetings. In those early days the man who spoke disrespectfully of the established religion was put into the stocks, or, in contumacious, was banished. The terrible clog of Jonathan Edwards dominated the land. Very naturally, there came a sharp reaction, which can be no better illustrated than by calling attention to the fact that "native Americans" stood unmixed with any foreign element in a hundred years. The better classes of Southerners are of almost equally unmixed blood, yet, admirable as many of their characteristics are, no one in these days rates them as the most representative of Americans. They lack in breadth of view, they lack the energy and enterprise that have come to be synonymous with Americanism all over the world, they lack poise and self-control. Senator Tillman—who is not, it must be said, a representative Southerner—is, nevertheless, a native American.

The native American certainly does not monopolize the race virtues. The adopted American figures everywhere in business, in society, in the professions, in politics, with credit to himself and to the country. A little modesty is becoming to the man whose great-grandfather was born here when he contemplates these things. He might consider, for instance, that Mr.

Rockefeller is a native American and that Mr. Carnegie is not, and ask himself whether, after all, it is so important to perpetuate the race in order to overcome foreign influences.

A paper read by Robert P. Porter at the recent convention on municipal ownership of public utilities was not favorable to such ownership of street railways. He said the street railways of the United Kingdom are about equally divided between the local authorities and the private companies, the former owning 700 miles of lines and the latter about 600 miles. With a few exceptions these tramways are not comparable in equipment or service with the 20,000 or more miles of line developed in the United States by private enterprise. Mr. Porter said the United Kingdom should have had by this time 4,000 or 5,000 miles of first-class electric railways instead of less than 1,500 miles, and it would have had this mileage had it not been for the stifling effect of municipal trading. The inference is that municipal ownership is not conducive to progress.

ONE OF THE THINGS WHICH THE LEGISLATION PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATING RATES FOR RAILROADS WILL DO WILL BE TO PUT AN END TO THE MUCH LOWER RATES WHICH IMPORTERS GENERALLY PAY THAN DO HOME COMPETITORS.

In many cases the rate of transportation from a European port to a point in the Mississippi valley is enough lower to nearly offset the tariff duty. For instance, salt from an English port to Kansas City is taken at the rate of 14 cents a hundred pounds, when the rate from Hutchinson, Kan., 200 miles, is 10 cents a hundred. Tin plate from points in Wales to points on the Missouri river pays only 50 per cent. of the rate from the Indiana gas field to the same point. The railroad rate on cement from New Jersey to Chicago is greater than the rate on imported cement plus the tariff.

NATIVE AMERICANS.

Now that President Roosevelt and President Eliot have stirred the matter up, a great many other people have taken alarm over the tendency to small families among native Americans, and through pulpits and press are lamenting the possible dying out of "American stock." Not one of all these agitated persons takes the trouble to explain exactly what he means by "American stock." A native American is an individual who is born in this country of parents who are legal citizens and not mere transient visitors. The parents may have "come over" last week, or last month, or last year; if they came with the intention of making this country their home their child becomes a native American and may make a very good citizen. But, plainly, it is not such citizens as these who are alluded to as "American stock." The Americans meant are presumably those whose ancestry in this country goes back several generations. But just how many generations? Perhaps Mr. Eliot has in mind the first settlers of New England and their descendants. Mr. Roosevelt may consider that the blood of the early Dutch settlers is an important element in the race foundation of his country. But are all the people who are so suddenly anxious about the life and permanency of their race counting back to the colonial period, or even to the revolution? The influences of the Pilgrims and the Puritans of New England, the Hollanders of New York, the followers of Penn and the mixed aristocracy and ticket-of-leave settlers of Virginia were strong, and together went to make up many lasting traits of American character, but other elements came into the race later and left other marks that are now as much a part of the native make-up as any that were inherited from Mayflower ancestors. It is over a hundred years since the revolution. Within that time many nationalities have mingled their characteristics with those that were known as American when the nineteenth century opened. From Germany, Ireland, Scotland, immigrants flocked in the first half of that century, and who can tell their descendants now from, say, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, so far as the possession of genuine American spirit is concerned—a spirit made up of loyalty, energy, self-confidence, courage and adaptability? Moreover, in what respect do these differ from the children and grandchildren of the immigrants of half a century ago and less? Assimilation has been a rapid process, and the man who, because his forefathers were pioneers in the new country, assumes a race superiority over the man whose father was not born here makes a claim which probably has no basis. Senator Hoar told an Indianapolis audience the other day what effect the admixture of Irish blood had upon the American character. The influence of Germans and other races is not less apparent.

Probably what the alarmists who are bemoaning the small size of native American families really fear is the rapid increase of the Italian, Russian and Polish immigrants who have come in recent years in such hordes that they cannot be so easily assimilated. But there is some good in every race, and inasmuch as the American race at its purest is composite, it is improbable that the best that is in these newer elements of the population will eventually be assimilated and be made a part of our native character? Moreover, it is well to feel such a complacent satisfaction in native Americanism as it now exists? The native does not always cover himself with glory when untrammelled by "foreign" influences; his course is not always to be approved. There, for example, is Kansas, a State almost entirely populated by native Americans. The financial vagaries that in recent years have given the country so much trouble took firmer hold upon the people of that commonwealth than any other, and, as events have shown, the people there are likely at any time to come to the support of freakish doctrines of all sorts.

There, too, are the people of the Southern States. These States have received almost none of the foreign immigration of the last century. The mountain whites of whom John Fox, Jr., writes, and the "poor whites" of States further South are "native Americans" stock unmixed with any foreign element in a hundred years. The better classes of Southerners are of almost equally unmixed blood, yet, admirable as many of their characteristics are, no one in these days rates them as the most representative of Americans. They lack in breadth of view, they lack the energy and enterprise that have come to be synonymous with Americanism all over the world, they lack poise and self-control. Senator Tillman—who is not, it must be said, a representative Southerner—is, nevertheless, a native American.

The native American certainly does not monopolize the race virtues. The adopted American figures everywhere in business, in society, in the professions, in politics, with credit to himself and to the country. A little modesty is becoming to the man whose great-grandfather was born here when he contemplates these things. He might consider, for instance, that Mr.

Rockefeller is a native American and that Mr. Carnegie is not, and ask himself whether, after all, it is so important to perpetuate the race in order to overcome foreign influences.

A paper read by Robert P. Porter at the recent convention on municipal ownership of public utilities was not favorable to such ownership of street railways. He said the street railways of the United Kingdom are about equally divided between the local authorities and the private companies, the former owning 700 miles of lines and the latter about 600 miles. With a few exceptions these tramways are not comparable in equipment or service with the 20,000 or more miles of line developed in the United States by private enterprise. Mr. Porter said the United Kingdom should have had by this time 4,000 or 5,000 miles of first-class electric railways instead of less than 1,500 miles, and it would have had this mileage had it not been for the stifling effect of municipal trading. The inference is that municipal ownership is not conducive to progress.

ONE OF THE THINGS WHICH THE LEGISLATION PROHIBITING DISCRIMINATING RATES FOR RAILROADS WILL DO WILL BE TO PUT AN END TO THE MUCH LOWER RATES WHICH IMPORTERS GENERALLY PAY THAN DO HOME COMPETITORS.

In many cases the rate of transportation from a European port to a point in the Mississippi valley is enough lower to nearly offset the tariff duty. For instance, salt from an English port to Kansas City is taken at the rate of 14 cents a hundred pounds, when the rate from Hutchinson, Kan., 200 miles, is 10 cents a hundred. Tin plate from points in Wales to points on the Missouri river pays only 50 per cent. of the rate from the Indiana gas field to the same point. The railroad rate on cement from New Jersey to Chicago is greater than the rate on imported cement plus the tariff.

NATIVE AMERICANS.

Now that President Roosevelt and President Eliot have stirred the matter up, a great many other people have taken alarm over the tendency to small families among native Americans, and through pulpits and press are lamenting the possible dying out of "American stock." Not one of all these agitated persons takes the trouble to explain exactly what he means by "American stock." A native American is an individual who is born in this country of parents who are legal citizens and not mere transient visitors. The parents may have "come over" last week, or last month, or last year; if they came with the intention of making this country their home their child becomes a native American and may make a very good citizen. But, plainly, it is not such citizens as these who are alluded to as "American stock." The Americans meant are presumably those whose ancestry in this country goes back several generations. But just how many generations? Perhaps Mr. Eliot has in mind the first settlers of New England and their descendants. Mr. Roosevelt may consider that the blood of the early Dutch settlers is an important element in the race foundation of his country. But are all the people who are so suddenly anxious about the life and permanency of their race counting back to the colonial period, or even to the revolution? The influences of the Pilgrims and the Puritans of New England, the Hollanders of New York, the followers of Penn and the mixed aristocracy and ticket-of-leave settlers of Virginia were strong, and together went to make up many lasting traits of American character, but other elements came into the race later and left other marks that are now as much a part of the native make-up as any that were inherited from Mayflower ancestors. It is over a hundred years since the revolution. Within that time many nationalities have mingled their characteristics with those that were known as American when the nineteenth century opened. From Germany, Ireland, Scotland, immigrants flocked in the first half of that century, and who can tell their descendants now from, say, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, so far as the possession of genuine American spirit is concerned—a spirit made up of loyalty, energy, self-confidence, courage and adaptability? Moreover, in what respect do these differ from the children and grandchildren of the immigrants of half a century ago and less? Assimilation has been a rapid process, and the man who, because his forefathers were pioneers in the new country, assumes a race superiority over the man whose father was not born here makes a claim which probably has no basis. Senator Hoar told an Indianapolis audience the other day what effect the admixture of Irish blood had upon the American character. The influence of Germans and other races is not less apparent.

Probably what the alarmists who are bemoaning the small size of native American families really fear is the rapid increase of the Italian, Russian and Polish immigrants who have come in recent years in such hordes that they cannot be so easily assimilated. But there is some good in every race, and inasmuch as the American race at its purest is composite, it is improbable that the best that is in these newer elements of the population will eventually be assimilated and be made a part of our native character? Moreover, it is well to feel such a complacent satisfaction in native Americanism as it now exists? The native does not always cover himself with glory when untrammelled by "foreign" influences; his course is not always to be approved. There, for example, is Kansas, a State almost entirely populated by native Americans. The financial vagaries that in recent years have given the country so much trouble took firmer hold upon the people of that commonwealth than any other, and, as events have shown, the people there are likely at any time to come to the support of freakish doctrines of all sorts.

There, too, are the people of the Southern States. These States have received almost none of the foreign immigration of the last century. The mountain whites of whom John Fox, Jr., writes, and the "poor whites" of States further South are "native Americans" stock unmixed with any foreign element in a hundred years. The better classes of Southerners are of almost equally unmixed blood, yet, admirable as many of their characteristics are, no one in these days rates them as the most representative of Americans. They lack in breadth of view, they lack the energy and enterprise that have come to be synonymous with Americanism all over the world, they lack poise and self-control. Senator Tillman—who is not, it must be said, a representative Southerner—is, nevertheless, a native American.

The native American certainly does not monopolize the race virtues. The adopted American figures everywhere in business, in society, in the professions, in politics, with credit to himself and to the country. A little modesty is becoming to the man whose great-grandfather was born here when he contemplates these things. He might consider, for instance, that Mr.

man had stopped falling before he went on his way.

Gossip.

"Is it true that the elder Miss Bullion is to marry her father's clerk?"  
"Oh, yes. I understand he was threatened with discharge if he didn't accept."

Not Well Put.

New York Weekly.  
She—Am I the first woman you ever loved?  
He—Yes. Am I the first man you ever loved you?  
She (temporarily)—You are insulting.

Strong Indication.

Judge.  
Lore-Jane tells me that her fiancé is worth a hundred thousand dollars. Do you believe it?  
Ellis—No. I don't believe it. Why, he paid taxes on twenty-five thousand without a murmur.

New Style.

New York Evening Sun.  
Gobang—Will you come satisfaction in telling him what I thought of him.  
Ukelele—But where did you see him?  
Gobang—I didn't see him at all. I worked on him by mental telepathy.

The Usual Way.

Chicago Post.  
"Now that they at last have a fine city home I suppose they will follow the usual plan."  
"What's that?"  
"Spend their summers at the seashore and their winters in California."

Out of Condition.

"Tis said that Professor Old of Warwick (a personage very well known).  
Disfranchised his physician.  
A man of position.  
For making him drink paragonic.

Glad of It.

Answers.  
Little Boy—That ink that papa writes with isn't indelible ink, is it, mother?  
Mother—No.  
"I'm glad of that."  
"Why?"  
"I've split it all over the carpet."

Job Could Not Stand It.

Had Job been tried in such a way  
As poor mortals are to-day,  
His patience might have got a jar.  
Suppose, for instance, he should ride  
Wedged in for half an hour car!  
The man who whooping and howling  
Into a stuffy, crowded car!

ABOUT PEOPLE AND THINGS.

From the profits of the Methodist Book Concern \$75,000 has been appropriated for superannuated preachers. The amount last year was \$60,000.  
Dr. Sachs, a Vienna oculist, has invented an apparatus by which the whole dark inner part of the eye can be illuminated. The invention marks a great advance in science.  
It is definitely announced that Dr. Friedrich Muehle, Professor Lorenz's assistant in the practice of "bloodless surgery," will return to this country next month to accept the professorship of Orthopedics in the Medical College of the University of Chicago.  
The New York Evening Post announces that Mr. Rollo Ogden, a member of its editorial staff for twelve years, has succeeded Mr. Horace White as editor-in-chief. Mr. White retired from the chief editorship on the first day of the year, leaving an editorial connection with The Post and remains president of The Evening Post Company.  
Joseph Wharton, of Philadelphia will build an addition to the University of Pennsylvania, costing \$300,000, for the accommodation of the school of finance and economy in that institution, which he founded several years ago. His total gifts to the university have thus far amounted to over \$300,000.  
William H. Spilman, of Hagerstown, Md., has entered a claim for a pension of \$30 a month on rather novel grounds. As a child during the civil war he witnessed a skirmish between the Federal and Confederate troops near Hagerstown, and was frightened into a paralytic stroke, which permanently injured him. His claim is now before Congress.  
Admission to full-fellowship in learned societies of England has only lately been granted to women, and the success of it is due to Mrs. Farquharson, of Houghton. The Linnean Society has made her a fellow on the score of her attainments, but before doing so it was necessary to alter the charter. "Without distinction of sex" were the words.  
In a Boston kindergarten, the teacher illustrated the art of butter-making by sending out for a pint of cream and stirring it with an egg beater. Each little scholar helped, and each had a taste of the new butter on a cracker, and each had a second helping. This way of making a small amount of fresh butter may be welcome to householders who are short of butter.

The report of Commander Booth-Tucker, of the Salvation Army in America, shows an increase in the last six years from \$300,000 to \$450,000 expended in charities and a growth from 2,304 to 3,048 in the number of officers, cadets and employees, by whom this vast amount of money was expended. Million poor were provided with dinners on last Christmas day.  
Very many people know what King Edward's real surname is, but few are reduced to the rank of a commoner he would be known simply as Mr. Wettin. The prince consort was a prince of the ancient house of Sax-Coburg. The counts of Wettin were the founders of the illustrious line of princes, and the prince consort's name was Wettin. Just before her late Majesty's birth in 1840, and if a queen takes her husband's name became a Wettin on her marriage. His Majesty's real name is, therefore, Albert Edward Wettin.

The will of Dr. Bushrod James, of Philadelphia, devised to the city of Philadelphia \$50,000 and several pieces of real estate for a free hospital for the treatment of diseases of the eye, nose, ear, throat and lungs. The proposed hospital is to be called the Washington James Eye and Ear Institute. Dr. James also gave to the city much property as well as real estate for a free public library, which shall contain especially books for children, the aged and the blind. The library is to be called the Coronado and Coronado, Cal., and the American Temperance University at Harriman, Tenn.

The German Emperor has come into possession of another windfall. A German merchant named Hilberbrand, of Dresden, who for many years has been established at Berne, recently died, and, having no heirs, bequeathed a considerable fortune and a quantity of land to the Emperor. The Kaiser became the proprietor of the Ifigen Alp, which is situated between the Weinshorn and Widdhorn. The Nielsen farm stood the level of the Kaiser's estate, situated in the canton of Berne. To give an idea of the extent of the property which his Majesty inherited, it is said that it takes five hours' hard walking to cross it.

Mr. Howells on After-Dinner Speakers.

Harper's Magazine.  
The fact-homorous speaker has an easier career than even the fake-eloquent speaker. Yet at any given dinner the orator who passes out mere eloquence to his hearers has a success almost as instant and splendid as his clowning brother. It is amazing what things people will applaud when they have the courage of each other's ineptitude. They will applaud a man who says nothing but reason. They prefer also the old speakers to new ones; they like the familiar lapses of the old speaker. They have tasted the brew before, they know what they are going to get. The note of their mood is not of